

Subhi Eldeiry Address: 15 Brook Street Rensselaer, NY 12144 03/10/2008

Randy W Gibson examiner
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Mr. Gibson:

1

i.

Thank you very much for your correspondence dated 02/28/2008. Enclosed please find revised abstract to comply with the 150 word limit. Regarding rejection of specifications please reconsider based on the following:

- Claims 1 through 3 point to a method not equipment or design.
 Construction of equipment or designing complex devices requires professional assistance and considerable capital.
- Equipment and technology already existing in markets would be used by businesses choosing this method. The method is a unique yet unobvious new use of existing technology including the internet and existing wireless products and networks. Patents are granted for new uses all the time. Businesses will seek required licenses or permissions to use existing technology.
- New products that emerge in markets or are innovated by new businesses have the opportunity to be used. The author is an individual retired physician not a corporation and not affiliated with any institution. Resources required to bring the innovation to reality are lacking.
- To my knowledge and understanding the USPTO does not require burdening the individual inventor with these expenses. This is clearly wisdom in order not to restrict patents to major corporations and institutions. For millennia before major enterprises, individual

inventors supported progress of humanity. This has been even more conspicuous within the USA.

- The diagram included in the application was not meant as a drawing of a specific design or equipment. It was meant only as a diagrammatic illustration to help interested businesses and readers to understand the method. The method embodies diversified potentials. Some examples were given within the application. No drawing could be prepared even by professionals to cover all possibilities. The author wisely left that to businesses that choose the method and want to custom build equipment or design. It should be obvious that this method is about weighing and scales. No one should expect one drawing or design of a scale to be suitable for weighing a newborn human being and at the same time weigh a truck or an ox or a tiny object in a scientific lab. Although weighing devices are essential for the method the purpose of the method is to serve especially health, commerce, and education among other uses. The method in its totality involves new uses of existing products.
- It is not easy for any thinker to come up with an innovation covering diversified applications. If the innovation is not obvious it is supposed to be so. As a matter of fact the USPTO seems to require innovations to be unobvious. Wireless transmission existed for some time before. But using wireless transmission within a weighing device to serve health care and commerce among many other uses in the manner described in the method is *new and currently unobvious*.
- The application was prepared to the best of my ability. Rejection of the innovation based on semantics or lack of resources or inability of the author to understand complex legal language would deprive the USA and the world of great potential benefits especially in health care. WEIGHNTEL was referred to within my recently published book "GLOBAL HEALTH". It took decades to write the book and



work hard to bring this innovative method to light. No matter what happens, there could be use in the future of the method directly or indirectly. This is a good thing. But that would be without USA protection. Please give this a thought.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Subhi K. Eldeiry

APPLICATION NO.

10613.153

FILING DATE

07/07/2003

CONFIRMATION NO.

6739

EXAMINER: GIBSON, RANDY W

MAIL DATE 02/28/2008

Date of this correspondence 03/10/2008

Art Unit 2841

Again thank you very much for your service. Respectfully,

5. Elderry Dr. Subhi Eldeiry

Enclosures:

- 1. Revised Abstract
- 2. This 3 pages letter